



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,320	12/22/2000	Phyllis R. Budka	243768044US	1285

7590 07/06/2004

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
7 TH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

COLON, CATHERINE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/747,320

Applicant(s)

BUDKA ET AL.

Examiner

C. Michelle Colon

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/9/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a Non-Final Office Action in response to the communication received on December 22, 2000. Claims 1-19 are now pending in this application.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The examiner has reviewed the patents supplied in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) provided on October 9, 2001.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-12 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knudson et al. (U.S. 5,765,140).

As per claim 1, Knudson et al. discloses a data structure for an automated project tracking system, the data structure residing in a computer readable memory and comprising:

a project window comprising a project identification field formatted to receive and display a project identifier and a project status field formatted to receive and display a project status (col. 2, lines 42-46 and 56-64; col. 4, lines 47-67; Figure 1; The system discloses a project tracking system that incorporates the well known "windows" interface

and appearance to view and edit project data such as identification and status information. Projects are tracked and maintained in a database.);

a request window comprising a request identification field formatted to receive and display a request identifier and a request status field formatted to receive and display a request status (col. 5, lines 15-31; col. 6, lines 4-30; The system discloses a request window (TES/Plan interface module) through which users request to assign resources to project tasks. Only authorized users with designated levels can access/edit the system.); and

a task window comprising a task identification field formatted to receive and display a task identifier and a task status field formatted to receive and display a task status (col. 7, lines 1-14; col. 9, lines 48-50; The system discloses a task window (TES/PC module) in which task identifier and status are displayed to a user.).

As per claim 2, Knudson et al. discloses the data structure of claim 1, wherein the project window further comprises a request list, comprising:

a request identification field formatted to display a request identifier for each of a number of requests for a project and a request status field formatted to display a request status for each of the number of requests for the project (col. 5, lines 53-58; col. 6, lines 4-30; The system discloses a request window (TES/Plan interface module) through which users request to assign resources to project tasks.).

As per claim 3, Knudson et al. discloses the data structure of claim 1 wherein the request window further comprises a task list, comprising:

a task identification field formatted to display a task identifier for each of a number of tasks for a request for a project and a task status field formatted to display task status for each of the number of tasks for the request for the project (col. 6, lines 4-36; col. 7, lines 1-14; Figure 4; The system discloses a task assignments table, which identifies individual tasks and tracks their status as well as the responsible resource.).

As per claim 4, Knudson et al. discloses the data structure of claim 1 wherein the task window further comprises an invoice list, comprising:

an invoice identification field formatted to display an invoice identifier for each of a number of invoices for a task and an invoice amount field formatted to display an invoiced amount for each of the number of tasks (col. 9, lines 1-4; The system discloses billing and charge back functionalities in the project tracking system.).

As per claim 5, Knudson et al. discloses the data structure of claim 1 wherein the task window further comprises:

a committed amount field formatted to automatically display a cumulative total of amounts committed to a project and an invoiced amount field formatted to automatically display a cumulative total of amounts invoiced to the project and a balance amount field formatted to automatically display a difference between the cumulative total of amounts committed to the project and the cumulative total of amounts invoiced to the project (col. 8, lines 4-40; The system tracks the progress of project tasks so that cumulative labor costs are also tracked.).

As per claim 6, Knudson et al. discloses the data structure of claim 1 wherein the project window further comprises a funding source list, comprising:

a funding source identification field formatted to display a funding source identifier for each of a number of funding sources for a project and a funding amount field formatted to display a funding amount for each of the number of funding sources for the project (col. 8, lines 10-29; The system discloses mapping funding sources to projects, where the funding sources are identified and stored in a database.).

As per claim 7, Knudson et al. discloses the data structure of claim 1 wherein the request window further comprises a request list, comprising:

a request identification field formatted to display a request identifier for each of a number of requests for a project and a request status field formatted to display a request status for each of the number of requests for the project (col. 5, lines 53-58; col. 6, lines 4-30; The system discloses a request window (TES/Plan interface module) through which users request to assign resources to project tasks.).

The limitations of claims 8-12 and 14-19 are substantially similar to those recited in claims 1-7. As such, claims 8-12 and 14-19 are rejected based on the same reasoning applied to claims 1-7 above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al. (U.S. 5,765,140) as applied above.

As per claim 13, Knudson et al. does not expressly disclose wherein the visual representation of the project widow is in a first color, the visual representation of the request window is in a second color and the visual representation of the task window is in a third color. However, Knudson et al. does disclose utilizing the appearance of typical Microsoft windows (col. 6, lines 55-67). It is old and well known for the windows of Microsoft to be able to be altered in terms of size, color and font. Thus, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the system of Knudson et al. to utilize the appearance features/functions of its Microsoft windows application so that users can more easily view the different data of the project, thus enhancing the user-friendliness of the project tracking system.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Barnard et al. (U.S. 6,684,191) discusses a system and method for assessing a procurement and accounts payable system;
- Barnard et al. (U.S. 6,738,746) discusses a system and method for assessing a procurement and accounts payable system.

Art Unit: 3623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Michelle Colon whose telephone number is 703-605-4251. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached at 703-305-9643.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks***

***Washington D.C. 20231***


or faxed to:

703-872-9306	[Official Communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]
703-746-7202	[For status inquiries, draft communication, labeled "Proposed" or "Draft"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 7<sup>th</sup> floor receptionist.

  
cmc

June 27, 2004

  
**TARIQ R. HAFIZ**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 6000